

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Nesbitt
<b>Given Name</b>	Clare
<b>Person ID</b>	1286878
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Nesbitt
<b>Given Name</b>	Clare
<b>Person ID</b>	1286878
<b>Title</b>	JPA 19: Bamford / Norden
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal is not accompanied by proposals for additional schools near the site, and existing local schools are all full. This is not justified and not consistent with national policy</li> <li>- Our local area already has poor links to rail and metro networks, it will become even harder to reach these networks with increased traffic levels from what is likely to be 700-900 additional cars on our road. It means families get less time together because of increased commuting times, which adds up each day. The site fails to comply with PfE objective 7, and is not consistent with adapting to climate change or moving to a low carbon economy. It isn't consistent with NPPF Chapters 2 (paragraph 8) and 9</li> <li>- There will therefore be higher vehicle emissions, which flies in the face of Rochdale Council declaring a climate emergency 2 years ago</li> <li>- Instead, there are existing brownfield sites in more accessible locations which could be used to greater benefit - either by including brownfield sites which aren't currently part of the proposals, or by increasing densities on proposed brownfield sites closer to transport hubs, however this approach isn't as financially lucrative to developers as developing on greenbelt</li> <li>- I do not believe the evidence presented by the developers proves exceptional circumstances to build on greenbelt land, and a number of alternative brownfield sites aren't included in their submissions because it's more lucrative to build 450 detached homes</li> <li>- The site is publicly accessible greenbelt land, and of great community value in its current form. As such it is protected by national planning policy</li> <li>- There is no significant shortage of detached executive homes in Rochdale</li> </ul>
<b>Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you</b>	I believe that JPA 19 Bamford/Norden should be removed from the PfE

**consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.**